



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 22/10/12

**gan Emyr Jones BSc(Hons) CEng
MICE MCMI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 26/11/12

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22/10/12

**by Emyr Jones BSc(Hons) CEng MICE
MCMI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 26/11/12

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/12/2184344

Site address: 5 Chapel Court, High Street, Southsea, Wrexham LL11 5PB

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Matthew Platt against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2012/0293, dated 10 April 2012, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2012.
 - The development proposed is a first floor bedroom/en-suite extension and a new front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.

Reasons

3. *Local Planning Guidance Note No. 20: House Extensions* cites that 'the size and scale of the resulting extension should not over-dominate the existing dwelling' as one of a number of points to be borne in mind. Insofar as 2-storey and first floor side extensions are concerned, this can be achieved by a combination of a lower ridge than, and a setback from the front of, the main house.
4. In this case, the proposed first floor side extension, with no stepping down of the ridge or setting back of the front elevation, would be of a scale and mass that would not have a subordinate relationship with the main dwelling. Such an extension would appear as a dominant feature that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area and the proposal, therefore, conflicts with *Wrexham Unitary Development Plan* policy GDP1.
5. The appellant suggests that setting back the first floor extension would give the property an untidy appearance as it would be above a previous ground floor garage/utility room extension whose front elevation is 1 metre forward of that of the main dwelling. I do not share such concerns and am of the view that such an arrangement would result in the original form of the dwelling remaining clearly discernible with two more recent subsidiary elements to the front and side.

6. The appellant considers that setting back the front elevation would not leave the space required for the room created to be a main bedroom. However, a reduction of 1 metre or so in its longest dimension would still leave a useable double bedroom with room for en-suite provision. In any event, this is not sufficient reason to outweigh the identified harm and conflict with policy.
7. The appellant is dissatisfied with the way his application was handled by the Council. Be that as it may, I have considered the appeal as if the application had been made to me in the first place and on the basis of its individual planning merits.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Jones

Inspector